ON ERIONEURON PILOSUM VAR. LONGEARISTATUM: A RECTIFYING COMMENT

Ana M. Anton

Carrera del Investigador (CONICET). Instituto Multidisciplinario de Biología Vegetal, Casilla de Correo 495, 5000 Córdoba, Argentina

En 1977 (Kurtziana 10: 58) I proposed a new combination: Erioneuron pilosum var. longearistatum (Kurtz) Anton, on the basis of Triodia avenacea var. longearistata Kurtz. At the same time, and according to Art. 7 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1972: 19; 1983: 7), I selected the specimen Kurtz 6729 (CORD) as lectotype of the variety, explaining in a footnote the reasons for such a decision. Furthermore, I clearly stated that Pringle 406 had to be excluded from the nomenclatural types of this entity, because it belongs to Erioneuron avenaceum var. grandiflorum (Vasey) Gould, a plant restricted to western Texas, southern New Mexico and northern Mexico (Gould, Grasses of Texas: 220, 1975).

At this point it seems worthwhile to remember that when describing his variety Kurtz (Revista Mus. La Plata 5: 301. 1893) cited, before the original description, two Argentinian specimens: Kurtz 6729 (from "Colinas secas cerca de la Estancia La Era", CORD) and Hieronymus s/n (from "Entre Malagueño y San Antonio", CORD); then, at the end of his diagnosis, appears Pringle 406 (from Chihuahua, Mexico).

The present commentary is pertinent to make clear the inconsistency of Beetle's criticism (Phytologia 49, n° 1: 39. 1981) when he stated that my point of view "...is clearly in error". Disregarding my statement in the mentioned footnote "...ha de excluirse como tipo nomenclatural a Pringle 406 pues se trata de Erioneuron avenaceum var. grandiflorum", Beetle insists in basing the varietal name of Kurtz upon Pringle 406. In so doing, he does not take into account neither the other two specimens cited by Kurtz nor my lectotype proposal, being this in discordance with Art. 8.1 of the Code (1983: 7), and producing an illegitimate name. In fact, Pringle 406 belongs to E. avenaceum var. grandiflorum, a name which ought to have been adopted for the plants growing in the United States and Mexico (Art. 63, ICBN, 1983: 55) instead of the one of Beetle, who mistakenly relegates the valid name to the list of synonyms.